

The Sociological Analysis of Iran-Iraq War based on Parsons' Theory

Sasan Vadiea¹

Department of Sociology, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Received 11 December 2016

Revised 12 February 2017

Accepted 2 March 2017

Abstract: *The present study attempts to analyze Iraq war against Iran based on Parsons' subsystems. The main question aims at finding the social positive/negative functions of the war. According to the studies, the first effect of the war was damaging behavioral organism subsystem so that it couldn't realize its functions. Subsequently, the chaos spread to the personality subsystem. Except for the qualitative and the quantitative development of the defense industries, the war caused failure in most purposes of the first development plan drawn up the behavioral organism subsystem. To create unity and cohesion in the society and based on the specific necessities of wartime, the social subsystem ratified the laws tending to be supportive and economic, though it was not so successful. Eventually, the cultural subsystem which was influenced by the war could revive different values in various eras of wartimes and spread them to the society. It could also issue the necessary orders to other social subsystems so that they could confront the problem relating to the war. At the end of the war this subsystem relatively lost its effectiveness.*

Keywords: *Behavioral organism subsystem, personality subsystem, social subsystem, cultural subsystem, development and function.*

Introduction

War is undoubtedly one of the most perplexed social phenomena and in most cases has deeply created unwanted changes in the history of human life. Thus, war is considered as one of the essential variables of change in social life. Different wars originating from various factors have occurred in the annals of history and have left several outcomes. Ethnic-racial, doctrinal, political, economic, and other conflicts have ended in wars and inflicted huge human, social, psychological, and economic casualties and damages on societies. On the other hand, to make evolution, every country offers several development plans and tries to realize its goals by mobilizing all its human and material forces. Among the influential factors on the development process, the war phenomenon and its several aftermaths are perfectly tangible. Every war brings both negative and positive functions. Therefore, sociologists try to depict the war and its outcomes on the socio-economic development of countries. Catching a glance at the history of the country, one can realize that Iran has mostly encountered war as a social phenomenon which had led to many negative and positive consequences in many dimensions so that it has fundamentally encompassed the process of social and economic development of the country. In the annals of wars in Iran, Iraq war against Iran was the last but the most destructive war which caused the divergence of all usual processes and heavily endangered the social life. However, the main question seeks to find what the negative and the positive consequences of the war on Iran development are and to what extent it has weighed the socio-economic development of the country?

Theoretical Framework

As two important social phenomena, war and development influence the social life. To make progress in development and meet the material and spiritual needs of its members, every society has to determine its plans and development course so as to formulate the development plans. The present paper firstly introduces the sociological reasons of Iraq-Iran war, then investigates the war consequences based on its developmental outcomes according to parsons' subsystems theory in which Iran's the first development plan is explained. The reason for adopting this approach is in one hand parsons' systematic

¹ Email: Sas.vadiea@iauctb.ac.ir

view toward theorems and making his theory practical on the other hand. The negative and positive functions of Iraq war against Iran are investigated and analyzed within the frame work of Parsons' theory taking an organized attitude.

Parsons' Theory

Since the present study aims at analyzing the consequences of Iraq-Iran war based on Parsons' theory, its better first introduce this model in brief. According to Parsons, society is divided into four subsystems and every subsystem has its own institutions and organizations which assist the given subsystem to attain its goals. The subsystems are as it follows:

Behavioral Organism Subsystem

The function of this part is adaptation. Economy as the main institution which is associated with this sector, realizes the adjustment function through labor and production. Labor is a fundamental tool in economy by which the society associates itself to the environment attempting to survive under its protection. Money is also the sign of exchange linking economy to the society (Tavassolie, 1991:253).

a. Personality Subsystem

The function of this subsystem is goal attainment by determining the goals of system and mobilizing all sources to achieve these goals. Politics as the most important institution is associated with personality subsystem.

b. Social Subsystem

It creates integration by supervising all its constructive components. The corresponding institutions to this subsystem are legal institutions which realize the integration through drawing up laws and regulating them.

c. Cultural Subsystem

It accomplishes latency by equipping the actors reacting to the norms and values that encourage those actions. Latency is attainable through transferring norms and values. Therefore, culture is inculcated in the individual minds.

According Parsons, the four subsystems have special cybernetic and hierarchical order. Inspired by cybernetic theory, Parsons suggests that the action system is the place of constant circulation of energy and information so the exchange of energy and information among subsystems leads to the system's action (Roche, 1997:89). Cultural subsystem being on the top of other subsystems and receiving energy from the lower layers provides other subsystems with the necessary information for action and thus, it is assumed as the most important subsystem (Ritzer, 1995:139). Except for energy and information exchange, there is also input and exchange among subsystems. Any subsystem receives what is vital to its survival from other subsystems and instead provides them with what they require.

Table (1): Action environment

Function	Subsystem	Corresponding Institutions
Latency	Cultural	Family, religion, education
Integration	Social	Judiciary, Parliament
Goal attainment	Personality	Government ,politics, management
Adaptation energy	Behavioral organism	Economy

Sociological reasons behind Iraq's attack on Iran

To explain the sociological reasons of Iraq's invasion on Iran it should be said that domestic and foreign groups having their own specific aims were both on rivalry. Iranian society and its government was the political, social, ideological, and cultural representative of the society seeking for the cultural export of the revolution and have the political –cultural opposition with the United States which culminated in hostage taking crisis at American embassy. From long ago Iraq government as the dominating socio-political representative of its society had been in political, ethnic, and geopolitical rivalry with Iran that

led to confrontation in some cases. Missing Arvand River (Shat-ul-arab) and accepting Algiers Accord was considered as a kind of socio-political failure and ethnic contempt by Iraqis. On the other hand, Iraq was greatly afraid of the penetration of Islamic revolution of Iran into its own society which was dominated by Shia. Due to coasts limitation in northern part of Persian Gulf as well as indicating some sort of geopolitical interests, Iraq was also willing to gain the complete control of Arvand River in order to compensate for its economic and communicative shortages (War Publicity Center, 1987:91). In addition to the mentioned reasons, claiming the leadership of Arabs, Iraq was willing to the independency of the Arab living in Khuzestan and putting the three disputed Islands of Persian Gulf under the rule of UAE (Jafari voldani, 1998:71-76). All these factors which stemmed from ethnic-racial, geopolitical, economic, ideological and political issues made Iraq to compete and wage war with Iran.

Americans' trace as a foreign socio-political group was found in the equations relating to Iran. The advent of Islamic Revolution, escalated the political and socio-cultural rivalry between Iran and America and after the hostage –taking crisis at the American embassy in Tehran the interaction between Iran and America got hostile. America which was experienced enough with regard to revolutions knew that encouraging domestic or foreign wars is one of the ways to control or annihilate a revolution (Brinton, 1991:238). Besides invoking the unrests during transitional period, American officials misused the existing conflict between Iran and Iraq and by holding constant meetings with Iraqi officials encouraged them to attack Iran by any possible means .Consequently America came in with the aim of annihilating or weakening the revolution. The resultant of three socio-political groups of Iran, Iraq and America changed the struggling rivalries into a total war between Iran and Iraq aiming at weakening or annihilating the revolution and keeping Iran as a peripheral or semi-peripheral weak country being unable to continue its innate and spontaneous development and evolution. However, it can be said that Iraq-Iran war has had ethnic-racial, geopolitical, economic, ideological and political factors with synthetic and integrative function.

The war impact on behavioral subsystem or the society's economic system

The economy institution which plays a pivotal role in the behavioral organism subsystem is obliged to adapt human to the environment through labor and production and to materialize the basic needs of human beings and at the same time to provide other social subsystems with the needed outputs. It is obvious that a change can influence economic institution and its various sectors, disturb their process and weaken the duty performance and functions of other institution relating to it. It can be claimed that Iraq-Iran war has been one of the most destructive contemporary wars in terms of the economic consequences and damage scales. Dozens of cities and thousands of villages burnt in fire because of war and more than 324340 urban housing and buildings as well as 7639 rural houses were destroyed and several industrial enterprises were razed to the ground or partially got damaged (Ashofteh Tehrani, 1999:289).

Iran was challenging with the economic reconstruction which is a long and costly process. Therefore, the war caused hefty vulnerability of all macro and micro economic variables and brought economic imbalance in all fields. The decrease of Iran's oil production and its foreign exchange revenues occurred immediately after the onset of war. Naturally, that situation negatively affected the oil-based economy. It was after regaining its position in war that Iran oil exports and revenues increased once more. The Iraqis' attack on Iran's oil installations in the middle of war caused the fell in Iran's oil exports and a sharp slump as low as one-third of the pre-war figures in its oil revenues. As 80 percent of the government earnings and 90 percent of foreign exchange resource was provided by the oil revenues, this sharp decrease was catastrophic. Therefore, these blows to the oil industry culminated in an economic shock to the whole society. On the other hand, military expenditures were so sky-high that dedicated one third of the total budget to them. Mir-Hossein Moosavi, the former and the last prime minister, announced that 41 percent of the budget and more than 53 percent of the total credits of the government was devoted to the military and security affairs. This figure indicates that what a hefty sum of the foreign exchange revenues and Rial earnings was allocated and spent on war-related affairs. Spending such a huge budget was done at the cost of dynamism of the national economic and other productive sectors. Thus Iran's infrastructural projects slackened due to many shortages that the country encountered. For

all these reasons, Iran underwent one billion dollars of budget deficit and six billion dollars of foreign commitments (Chubin & Tripp, 1989:129).

The economic insecurity at the war time, during which about 800 big and small industrial units were damaged, made Iran to risk increasing the investment. On the other hand, the slump in foreign exchange earnings as well as the rise in military expenditures, discouraged investment in Iran and then followed by a serious fall in gross domestic product. The aggregate of gross constant capital stood at 5.1 billion rials during the war. Thus, the growth rate for gross constant capital equaled 0.6 billion rials. Aggregation of gross constant capital at constant prices of 1974, slumped from 0.5 billion rials in 1980 to 0.23 billion rials in 1988. Therefore, aggregation gross constant capital in 1986 decreased by 33.3 percent in comparison to average figure for eight years of war. According to constant prices of 1974, the total amount of gross domestic product stood at 49 billion rials per year. On the other hand, comparing to the average figure for eight years of war, gross domestic product in 1986 registered the highest amount of war ravages in Iran by being about 3 billion rials and down by 50 percent. War leads to reducing production and increasing unemployment which in turn help increase inflation. The price index of consumer goods and services had a significant rise from 68 in 1980 to about 275 at the end of war, which showed a high inflation rate during the war (Haghjoo, 1993:48). The shortage of essential goods, as the result of production decrease, created many problems for fair distribution of goods which culminated in a great rise in their price. They were sometimes sold three times more expensive than their usual price at the black market. It was difficult for many people to procure such vital goods. Although subsidies were paid in an oil dependent system, the increase in price and widening the gap between the poor and the rich went on. On the other hand, Iran's economic conditions were exacerbated as the result of devaluating of the national currency. To estimate the economic damages, the Management and Planning Organization issued a report on damages underwent by various economic and noneconomic sectors during eight years of war. Generally saying, damages are categorized as economic damages and human casualties. Since measuring human casualties, war disabled and psychological aftermaths are impossible in quantifiable terms,

The existing figures are just an estimation of the economic loss. Direct loses are found with facilities, equipment, and capacities, which are destroyed due to direct damages while indirect losses relate to facilities, equipment, and capacities which could be used for the purposes in the absence of war. On the other hand, facilities and resources taken up by war during that period could have been utilized for other purposes and are thus, thought of as war losses. So among indirect costs of war, direct losses resulting from lack of production pertain to destruction of buildings, installations, machinery and equipment as well as increase in defensive resources for war is notable.

According to an official report issued by the Management and Planning organization, total direct and indirect damages in sectors such as agriculture, mines, industries, oil, electricity, gas, water, construction and service have been estimated 65,353,749 billion Rials of which 53 percent was pertained to indirect losses at 34.5 billion Rials, while direct losses accounted for 47 percent of the figure at 30.8 billion Rials. Iran put final figure of direct and indirect losses of war at 1000 billion dollars which conform to the estimation and hypotheses by Karman Mofid who studied various reports rendered by the Iranian officials at various junctures and found out that those reports suffered serious flaws. Therefore, he tried to delineate other aspects of economic damages of war in Iran through a scholarly research, Mofid indicates that due to the reduction in oil exports, hefty military expenditures which grew an annual average rate of 29,2 percent , cost of one million tons of crude oil per year which was given to Syria gratis, selling 2.5 million tons crude oil at a very low price to that country , increasing insurance premium on ships up to 5-10 times due to aerial attacks by Iraqi fighters to ships , considering discounts on shipping charges, importing refined oil products to meet domestic demand, which was a result of Iraq's attack on Iranian refineries and high cost of transportation of imported goods as a result of destruction of the Iranian main ports, Abadan and Khorramshahr, Iran has suffered 644.3 billion dollars in economic losses.

He maintains that the figure is only monetary cost of war does not include the cost of inflation, destruction of natural resources, delayed implementation of development plans, delay in educating the youth, cost of services and revenues that could have been provided by those died in the war, as well as the cost of providing services and aid in cash and in kind to families of martyrs and war disabled, which will add up to a very big figure (Mofid, 1987:133). Iraq's incessant attacks on Iran's economic infrastructures which constituted the main target of Saddam Hossein; hefty military expenditures, the cost of taking care of at least 1.5 million war refugees and 120,000 Iraqi expatriates in Iran reduced investment and all other factors which were mentioned, caused Iran's economic system to reach a deadlock so that Iran has crossed all its economic red lines by the end of the war and officials had no choice, but to end the war. Consequently, economy on top of other factors, made Iran relinquish the war. That war caused great disorder in the Iranian economic system and that disorder rapidly spread to other subsystems.

The effect of War on Personality Subsystem

Personality Subsystem is located quick after behavioral organism subsystem. Politics is the main pillar of this subsystem in which goals of the society are determined in accordance to its needs and facilities and then proper means for achieving those goals. Thus, goal attainment is the main function of this subsystem. This subsystem should receive the needed inputs including capital, labor and facilities provided by the economic subsystem to attain its goals. Therefore, to compile and implement development plans in line with the main goals of personality subsystem is its main mission. In this section, the First Economic Development Plan of the Islamic Republic of Iran from the viewpoint of goals and ways of attaining those goals will be reviewed to see the effects of the war between Iran and Iraq on that process.

The First Economic Development Plan was forwarded to the Islamic Consultative Assembly in 1983. Its major goals included human development, reducing dependence on oil exports, emphasis on agriculture, increasing investment, increasing gross domestic product, improving situation of the oppressed and underprivileged social classes, promoting justice and social welfare and fighting unemployment, preventing emigration from villages to cities in order to prevent sprawling of big cities, realizing import substitution policy as well as self-sufficiency in economy and defense. Regarding oil dependence decrease it is notable that if we considered statistics on oil exports and resultant revenues before and after the revolution, especially during the war, it would become clear that apart from the last two years of war, both share of oil exports and their revenues in economy was much higher than pre-revolution years. Crude oil exports and pertaining revenues shot up by about 7 percent, which was against the goals of the First Economic Development Plan. Also due to reduction in international oil prices and decrease in crude oil exports during the last two years of the Plan, the amount of crude oil exports and resultant revenues were much lower than predicted figures; that is 34.8 billion dollars in the last year of the Plan. Thus, war prevented realization of goals of First Economic Development Plan (Mofid, 1990:18). On the other hand, 7-percent growth in non-oil exports, as another goal of the plan was not realized and the government was practically faced with export reduction in the sector, which reached as low as half of the forecasted figure. Consequently, due to oil price fall, as well as serious reduction in oil and non-oil exports, the government was extremely short of foreign exchange, especially during the last two years of the war. That foreign exchange was supposed to be spent on infrastructural plans and therefore many plans like that disrupted by budget deficit.

With regard to attaining self-sufficiency in food and agriculture, it should be said that the First Economic Development Plan had strongly emphasized on agriculture. Despite all government efforts for increasing the area of cultivated lands and production, growth of agriculture production was much less than growth in population and it was even negative (-4 percent) for rice. The main reason behind government's inability to realize the sector's goals was low credit allocated to the sector as a result of huge military expenses and sharp drop in foreign exchange revenues due to oil export reduction and oil price decrease. Other reasons included shortage of specialized human force and immigration of villages to big cities (Menashri, 1990:328). Those factors were also stemmed from war and its casualties. Therefore self-sufficiency in agriculture was not realized and the country continued to import huge

foodstuff cargos which caused government to spend a large part of its foreign exchange revenues and domestic credits to pay subsidies on foodstuff.

On the other hand, the government failed to control immigration from villages to cities. Active human force in agriculture sector reduced sharply since agriculture activities were not beneficial anymore and also due to villagers' participation in the war and occupation of vast areas of fertile land along the Iran-Iraq border. As a result, millions of immigrants rushed into big cities from rural areas, which ended in burgeoning of population in Tehran and some other big cities, which caused many problems. Some officials warned about excessive growth of cities and population. Thus, another major goal of the first economic development plan tending to prevent immigration from villages to cities and control excessive growth of cities was not realized. The other goal of the first economic plan was to boost the country's independence through adopting import substitution policy and preventing consumerism. Realizing that goal depended on importing intermediate and capital goods and curbing consumption of imported goods. Undoubtedly, importing commodities would require foreign exchange and the import of nonmilitary goods will largely be affected by wide fluctuation in the revenues of the country's foreign exchange.

During the last years of the first economic development plan, due to continuous invasions on oil facilities and decreasing oil prices, Iran's oil revenues got greatly affected by fluctuations and then took a sudden sharp drop so that the total non-military imports slumped to about 10 billion dollars by 1986 and imports were reduced at an average annual rate of 18.7 percent. Reduction in imports affected import substitution policy because industries were facing problems for importing intermediate and capital goods and this was more noticeable for chemical and metal industries, which were a pivotal axis for industries' development during the First Economic Development Plan. Mofid (1987) claims that according to the First Economic Plan, the share of capital goods imports was to increase from 19.1 percent in the first year of the plan to 26.3 percent in its last year. However, statistics show that import of capital goods was half the predicted figure of the plan that in turn, negatively affected pertaining industries (Mofid, 1987:224). Thus, the plan also failed to realize its goals in this sector and taking perfect advantage of the capacity of industries to increase productivity, which was the main goal of the First Economic Development Plan, was not realized.

With regard to the realization of predicted rise in investment and growth in gross domestic product during the First Economic Development Plan, it should be said that Iran's foreign exchange revenues were largely reduced as a result of reduction in export and international oil prices. Moreover, the amount of damages and losses inflicted on various economic sectors was hefty due to Iraq's attacks and the rise in defense expenditures. Therefore, investment during the First Economic Development Plan constantly decreased. It is clear that the less the investment, the lower would be growth in gross domestic product. That is why as war casualties increased and investment reduced, the predicted 8.9 percent growth in gross domestic product during the First Economic Development Plan was not met. The decrease in investment made many development projects to ground to a halt. This ended in the reduction in industries' productivity, as well as the decrease in domestic product. Due to reduction in gross domestic product and production, there was shortage of essential goods and unfair distribution of those goods led to 30% inflation in the society which put terrible pressure on underprivileged social classes and widened the gap between the poor and the rich. In addition to facing major problems in procuring their essential goods and reduced purchasing power, the poor also had to cope with another major difficulty: high housing rental. Due to uneven distribution of physicians across the nation and shortage of medical practitioners in some part of the country, they were also facing health and treatment problems. Thus, other goals of the First Economic Development Plan in terms of realizing social justice and welfare, improving situation of the underprivileged social classes, housing, and health services were not realized and therefor another failure in plan. Regarding to job creation and fighting unemployment, which was another major goal of the First Economic Development Plan, it should be said that due to invasion and occupation of border regions and great waves of immigration of jobless war refugees, military attacks on industrial installations and economic firms as well as stagnant investment, which caused major industrial projects to be mothballed, the country, was facing a problem in the form of expanding unemployment, whose figure was at times put at about 4.5 million jobless people by some sources. As

a result, another developmental goal for creating jobs was not realized due to the outbreak of war and its consequences. The above conditions, in addition to disorder in all affairs, as well as disruption of exports and imports topped by uncontrollable change of conditions, faced officials in charge of compiling and implementing the First Economic Development Plan were realized. Disruption of social subsystems greatly overshadowed realization of the First Economic Development Plan's most important goal, which was human development. Not only quantitative goals of development were not realized, but also the intensity and domain of human values, whose task is to pave the way toward human perfection, shrank day by day.

The only aspect of the First Economic Development Plan, being relatively successful, was qualitative and quantitative development of defense industries. Since Iran was under arms embargo, it paid special attention to defense industries and it was so serious in this regard that during the war, two independent ministries were in charge of producing, repairing and maintaining fighting equipment. Expansion of defense industries empowered Iran to produce most of its needed ammunitions inside the country and to save 1.5 billion dollars in a single year. With regard to importance of qualitative and quantitative development of defense industries, it should be stated that in addition to self-sufficiency, boosting up-to-date technical knowledge, bolstering reverse engineering, foreign exchange saving, and confronting sanctions, those industries can be used for multiple purposes and help all-out development of the country. Some defense specialists maintain that defense industries enjoy a special dynamism, which can be extended to nonmilitary industries. (A group of writers, 2000:209). So military industries are used for dual purposes; that is both for producing military equipment and nonmilitary one. It goes without saying that this can lead to development of the country in all aspects. Also, those industries cause job creation and technology transfer, all of which helps development and can be embolden the experts to design new technologies. In view of the above facts, political system in Iran failed to implement the First Economic Development Plan due to war-related problems and apart from qualitative and quantitative development of defense industries, which was in line with import substitution policy, most projected goals of the plan were not attained. Therefore, the war had a very profound and inhibitory impact on Iran's development which is still in place.

The effect of War on Social Subsystem

The social subsystem is responsible for integration, coordination, and cohesion through passing suitable laws by legislative bodies and supervising people affairs. It is natural that the laws should take social conditions and needs. War, a social apocalypse, causes disruption of the normal conditions in the society and endangers the social life. But how the social subsystem converted in reaction to the war phenomenon?

As it was mentioned, military costs largely increased during the war and the oil exports and revenues got greatly slumped during the concluding years of the First Economic Development Plan and thus, the country was encountering shortages in terms of investment and gross domestic product. Inflation rate got 30 percent and the brokerage and the rules of the day were the black market economy. Essential goods were not accessible and the people were facing the unfair distribution of commodities. Social subsystem reacted to those conditions by instituting rations. This solution could work and remove some of the social problems in providing essential goods at the earlier years of the war, but later on the constant attacks on Iran's oil and industrial installations exacerbated the situation so regulating strict laws to prevent hoarding and unfair distribution of goods became inevitable.

To handle the problems, including shortage of goods, high prices, and public dissatisfaction, the government made special plans which mainly aimed at fighting the ongoing economic corruption. To this purpose, austere laws were passed. Economic terror and physical terror were considered equal and those who committed economic terror, were known as the one "spreading corruption on the earth" and, thus, capable of being condemned to death. The minister of commerce announced that economic terror is worse than physical terror as the economic terror tramples the rights of martyrs' families and other underprivileged social classes and the economic terrorists are worse than Saddam Hussein. Since the advent of the First Economic Development Plan, the economic terrorists were referred to revolutionary

courts. Prosecutor general who was in charge of economic crime ordered the shopkeepers to use price tags and issue invoice to other customers and noted that prices should be reasonable. The housing problem and increased discontent of the poor made the officials to pass laws for obligatory purchase of barren lands to build apartment blocks on or preventing people from owning unused housing units. Though, those laws in the housing sector were either ineffective or failed to improve the situation. To solve the problem of physician shortage in underprivileged areas of the country, a law was passed according to which newly graduated physicians had to spend several years practicing in those areas.

The sharp fall in oil revenues and hefty costs of the war made the government increase taxes as of the middle of the First Economic Development Plan. As this tax raise was to be passed as a law, the jurisprudential, political, economic, and social aspects of that issue were discussed. Some believed that putting this idea into practice was a must to continue with the war while others maintained that it was catastrophic to the poor as the rich can evade it.

Finally, the Taxation Act as a way to reduce oil dependence was ratified by the government. It announced that levying higher taxes at wartime was both acceptable and necessary. To this end, direct tax raised from 480 billion Rials to 552 billion Rials, whereas indirect tax was increased from 480 billion Rials to 643 billion Rials. In terms of sociological analysis of change in social subsystem, it should be said that the energy of war and its destructive aftermaths on behavioral and personality subsystems penetrated into the social subsystem, which is responsible for creating social coordination and cohesion. Naturally, the normal situation of some social systems is lost and become disordered under the war conditions, which then threatens the whole social life, under those conditioned, new laws passed and ratified in case of emerging conditions to prevent parts of the society against imminent collapse. Most of the laws were economic. However, in terms of seriousness of disorders, widespread shortcoming, and the absence of law-abiding culture in the society and lack of required executive guarantees for the approved laws, they practically failed to attain their goals thus, and some affairs were disorganized by the disorders and abnormalities in the society in the later years of war. So it can be concluded that despite the reactions shown by the social subsystem, due to the impact of war on it, it couldn't succeed to attain its goals in terms of cohesion, order, and integrity in the society. This was more tangible in economic affairs.

The effect of war on cultural subsystem

Cultural subsystem, being on top of other layers, is considered as the most important subsystem and the control room of other layers. Utilizing the values and norms, and influencing other subsystems, cultural subsystem is capable of supervising over and issuing orders to other subsystems. During Iran-Iraq war, the rapid flow of the energy to this subsystem was apparent. Because it deals with a lot of concepts such as sacrifice, resistance and defense, the order to resist against invasion is issued by this layer. That is why people had a widespread participation at the front and resisted the aggressors in border cities. Not only this subsystem issued the order to resist but it also issued the order for solidarity and unity which led to bolstering of people spirit and making them united at the time when political grouping was rife and economic sanctions were imposed on Iran by Western countries. This made war as the most important ongoing issue in the society. At the outburst of war, this subsystem reminded the society of other values including contentment, personal commitment and avoiding extravagance and consumerism which was mostly economic.

As the war became lengthy and economic pressure built up while gaining victory in war became more and more impossible, this subsystem tried to remind people of economic sanctions by big powers, calling it "siege by evil powers of the world", the bounties of God and blessings of the Islamic Revolution, and urged people to continue to resist. However, as economic and military pressures intensified and cities came under missile attacks, that subsystem gradually lost its force and society moved toward kind of apathy. This was a factor which made officials accept the UN resolution 598. Undermining cultural subsystem caused human values to lose in importance and this was relatively evident in the later years of war. As a result, war caused abnormalities in cultural subsystem in the form of weakening moral values and damaging social solidarity.

Conclusion

Based on Parson's model, the outbreak of Iraq's war against Iran, as an unexpected phenomenon to the Iranian society, created huge energy in the country, influenced society's subsystem. That huge energy first affected behavioral organism and economic subsystems before affecting other subsystems. Disruption of behavioral organism subsystem highly damaged the process of labor and production and discontinued the trend of creating economic output as an input for personality subsystem. Not only the primary needs of the society were not met, but the personality subsystem failed to attain its goals because their realization was possible through the help of economic outputs of which the most important was capital. Also due to serious disorder in society's subsystem, especially behavioral organism subsystem, realization of long-term and fundamental planning on the part of government got disrupted and if plans were made, they were not implemented. Consequently, the First Economic Development Plan failed to be practical in most parts.

The aftermath of war also engulfed social subsystem and that subsystem reacted according to the conditions. New laws were approved for taxation and economic laws, drafting, housing, health services, and similar instances or previous laws were reviewed. The war's energy finally reached cultural subsystem, which is in control room of the society. Under the new conditions, this subsystem sent information to other subsystems and created new values or revived some values after analyzing the situation and according to the stage of war. It should be said that changes in other subsystems were coordinated based on information sent by this subsystem. However, as pressure build up, this subsystem failed and lost its influence. Therefore war caused abnormalities in cultural subsystem, which gradually weakened some values and resulted in a lower degree of unity in the society. The Iran- Iraq war had both positive and negative consequences for the Iranian society. The war dealt heavy blows on the society and was perfectly negative from an economic viewpoint. Regarding developmental goals, it should be noted that apart from qualitative and quantitative development of defense industries being a step in line with import substitution and industrial development policy, most goals of the First Economic Development Plan were not realized. Thus, one can categorically claim that the war's impact on developmental goals was also mostly negative. Also, economic and military pressures led to abnormalities in cultural subsystem toward the end of the war and therefore the war was negative in this respect too.

Research findings indicate that the war first affected behavioral organism and economic subsystems of the society. Due to strategic importance of those subsystems, other subsystems were seriously influenced by damages to economic subsystem and failed to function properly. The war also revealed negative functions of a mono-cultural and industrial economy. One of the main reasons behind failure of economic sectors in Iran was sharp reduction in oil revenues as a result of war. The war also showed that industrial units which have been built over a long period of time at high costs can be destroyed in a few seconds to make great problems for other economic sectors. So to get rid of a mono-cultural economic system we must take effective steps and refrain from depending on development of the industrial sector alone.

References

1. A group of writers. Defense industry economy. Tehran: institute of Imam Hossain university press,2000.
2. Ashofteh Tehrani,Amir. Sociology of war and military forces. Tehran: Armaghan, pub 1994.
3. Brinton, Crain. Dissection of four revolutions. Translated by Mohsen Solasi. Tehran: No, 5th, edition, 1991.
4. Chubin, Shahram & Charles tripp. Iran and Iraq war: I. B Tauris & co. ltd, 1989.

5. Haghjoo, Nasser. Economic evaluation of the damages of war (1359-67), the first page. Volume 3, no 20, 1993.
6. Jafari Valdani, Asghar. The Persian Gulf crisis focus. Tehran: Kihan, pub 2nd edition, 1998.
7. Krayb, Ian. Modern social theory, from persons to Habermass. Translated by Abbas Mokhber. Tehran: Agah pub, 1999.
8. Menashri, Amir. Iran: a decade of war and revolution. New York: Holmes & Meier publisher inc, 1990.
9. Mofid, Kamran. Development planning in Iran- from monarchy to Islamic republic. Cambridge shire: Middle East and African studies press ltd, 1987.
10. Mofid, Kamran. The economic consequences of Iran – Iraq war: Middle East and African studies Press ltd, 1990.
11. Plan and budget organization. Final report on the assessment of the economic damages of the war imposed by Iraq on Islamic republic of Iran (1980-1988). Tehran: Islamic republic of Iran, 1991.
12. Political department of Islamic revolutionary guard corps. two years' war, Tehran: Iranian revolutionary guard's Islamic revolution, No date.
13. Rafiepoor, Framars . development and opposition. Tehran: Enteshar pub. 1998.
14. Ritzer, George. Contemporary sociological theory, translated by Mohsen Solasi. Tehran: Elmi pub, 1995.
15. Rooche, Gaey. Talcot Pearsons sociology. Translated by Abdou Hossain Nickgohar. Tehran: Bayan, 1997.
16. Skidmore, William. theoretical thinking in sociology. Translated by a group of translators. Tehran: safir pub 1991.
17. Tavassoli, Gholamabbas. Sociological theories. Tehran: SAMT, 1991.
18. War publicity center. Conflict against peace. Tehran: IRI supreme defense council and war publicity center. 1987.
19. Woodward, Bob. Commanders. Translated by Fereydoun Dolatshahi. Tehran: Etelaat, 1992.